


THE ORIGIN
OF
Homœopathy,

AND

Reasons for Preferring it to the Common
System of Medical Treatment;

WITH THE

BY-LAWS OF THE WORCESTER COUNTY
HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL SOCIETY.


DR. W. E. RICHARDS,

OFFICE,

24 FRONT STREET, WORCESTER, MASS.

REGULAR OFFICE HOURS — from 2 to 4 and 7 to 9 P. M.

ON SUNDAYS — from 12 to 2 P. M.

Chronic and Nervous Diseases treated by Electricity.

Worcester Homœopathic Pharmacy:

JOS. A. HOWLAND,

178 MAIN STREET, ... WORCESTER, MASS.



ANSWER TO THE QUESTION,

Where did Homœopathy Originate?

Dr. SAMUEL HAHNEMANN, the founder of Homœopathy, was born in Meissen on the 10th of April, 1755; in 1775 he entered the University of Leipzig. He remained here two years, supporting himself by translating from English into German. At the end of this time he went to Vienna; here the friendship of Quarin, physician to the Emperor, gave him unusual facilities for studying disease; then for two years he was librarian and physician to the Governor of Transylvania. After this he went to Erlangen, where he obtained his degree. In 1779 he commenced the practice of medicine. He wrote many original articles on medicine and the collateral sciences (particularly chemistry and mineralogy), and translated a number of English scientific works into German, etc.

At this stage of his life his knowledge of Arabic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, English, French and Italian had made for him many friends among classical scholars, and his thorough medical knowledge had done the same for him among medical men, of whom he counted Dr. Hufeland as his friend. In 1790, while translating Cullen's *Materia Medica*, he being dissatisfied with the explanation of the action of Cinchona, began to experiment on himself with the drug, and caught the first glimpse of that law of cure which he afterward gave his life to perfect.

He was six years examining it before he published it as the law of cure; fourteen years after this, or twenty after the discovery, he published his *Organon*; at the end of the next eleven years he published his *Materia Medica Pura*.

The immensity of his labors may be imagined from the following statistics: he translated 16 works from the English, 8 from the French, 1 from the Italian, 1 from the Latin; his original works in Latin number 10 octavo volumes, in German 23 octavo volumes, besides 41 essays and treatises on scientific subjects. He died in Paris, July 2d, 1843, in the 88th year of his age.

Homœopathy, since its discovery by Hahnemann, has grown with wonderful rapidity; in 1826 it was introduced into this country by Dr. Gram of New York. For a long time no progress was made beyond his immediate circle, but at length the success of the new mode of healing became known, and in seventeen years, or in 1843, the number of Homœopathic physicians in the country was 600; at the present time there are about 4000.

There are now five homœopathic colleges in this country, in successful operation, with an attendance of 350 students; we have besides this annual accession to our ranks, many intelligent converts from allopathy.

Let us glance briefly at the success of the new school compared with the old. At the Hospital of Gyongos, in Hungary, during five years of allopathic treatment, the mortality was from 15 to 16 per cent.; during 11 years of homœopathic treatment, from 9 to 10 per cent. In London, the St. George's Hospital (allopathic) shows a mortality of 18 per cent.; at the homœopathic hospital in the same city, mortality 4 to 5 per cent. At the Hospital of St. Marguerite, in Paris, the allopathic wards show a mortality of 10 to 12 per cent., the homœopathic wards 8 to 9 per cent. In the St. Louis (Mo.) Hospital, under allopathic care, the mortality was over 12 per cent. At the cavalry bureau hospital, in St. Louis, under homœopathic care, the mortality was 6-10 of one per cent. Dr. MacLoughlin, one of the medical inspectors of the board of health, handed to the British House of Commons a report favorable to homœopathy, which is now on file in their reports, in which he says that if he was taken with cholera, from what he had seen, he should prefer homœopathic treatment. It is well to observe that Dr. MacLoughlin is an eminent allopathic authority.

Homœopathic Physicians in Worcester County.

	OFFICE.	OFFICE HOURS.	
		A. M.	P. M.
DR. L. B. NICHOLS,	102 Main St., Worcester,		2 to 4 & 7 to 8
DR. W. B. CHAMBERLAIN,	9 Elm St., Worcester,	7 to 8	2 to 4 & 7
DR. DAVID HUNT,	110 Main Street, Worcester,	8 to 10	2 to 4 & 7 to 9
DR. W. E. RICHARDS,	24 Front St., Worcester,		2 to 6 & 7 to 9
DR. C. A. BROOKS,	Main St., Clinton,		1 to 3
DR. D. B. WHITTIER,	Summer St., Fitchburg,	7 to 9	1 to 3
DR. J. C. FREELAND,	79 Main Street, Fitchburg,	to 9	1 to 3
DR. F. H. UNDERWOOD,	Millbury,	7 to 9	12 to 1
DR. C. C. SLOCOMB,	Rutland,	7 to 9	7 to 9
DR. G. F. FORBES,	West Brookfield,	7 to 9	12 to 2
DR. F. R. SIBLEY,	Warren,	7 to 9	12 to 1
DR. C. B. HERBERT,	Milford,	7 to 9	
DR. G. H. TAFT,	Charlton,	7 to 9	
DR. GEO. S. ALBEE,	Milford,	1 to 3	7 to 8
DR. WM. KNIGHT,	Marlboro',	7 to 9	

REASONS

FOR

Preferring Homœopathy to the Common System of Medical Treatment.

"It is lamentable that while many of the medical guardians of life are wasting time on irrelevant trifles, and darkening counsel with words, thousands, yea, tens of thousands, are perishing that might be saved!"

Professor HENDERSON.

HAVING had nearly twenty years' experience of the blessings of the new system in my own family, and being thankful for its benign effects in cases of sickness occurring during that period, and having also witnessed its beneficial influence in many families known to me, I am anxious that others, with whom I may have no direct influence or means of personal recommendation, should share the benefits of its health-restoring powers. Seeing and hearing much of human suffering, and being neither blind nor indifferent, the writer cannot help deploring many deaths, which might, by the use of proper means, be averted, as well as an incalculable amount of pain, misery, and shattered health, caused by the well-meant, but deplorably cruel, unnecessary, and destructive appliances of the old system of treating disease.

The following are some of my reasons for preferring homœopathy, and being thankful for it:

I.—*Because Homœopathy is attended with LESS MORTALITY than the old system.*

The evidence in proof of this would fill a volume. The following is a mere specimen: *Inflammation of the Lungs*, a very acute and dangerous disease, has been carefully investigated by Professor Henderson of Edinburgh, and the mortality attending it under every mode of treatment deduced by him with the utmost fairness, and the results, so far as the two systems are concerned, are as follows: The average number of deaths out of every 100 cases treated allopathically is 21; whilst under homœopathy the deaths are only 8 out of every 100.

Pleurisy is another acute and dangerous disease; but under homœopathic treatment, only about 1 in 100 die, while the mortality under the ordinary treatment is from eight to sixteen times greater. The saving of life by the adoption of homœopathic treatment in *inflammation of the bowels*, is about as great as *pleurisy*. It may be to some more satisfactory, perhaps, to hear what "the other side" say. The next witness therefore, shall be one whose testimony cannot be called in question, inasmuch as he is a writer *against* homœopathy, and his testimony confirms the statement that "whenever statistics are *honestly* quoted, even by its opponents, they tell in favor of homœopathy."

INFLAMMATION OF THE LUNGS.

	Admitted.	Died.	Mortality. pr. ct.
Allopathic Hospital, Vienna,	1134	260	23
Homœopathic " "	538	28	5

PLEURISY.

Allopathic Hospitals,	1017	134	13
Homœopathic " "	386	12	3

INFLAMMATION OF THE BOWELS.

Allopathic Hospitals,	628	84	13
Homœopathic " "	184	8	4

DYSENTERY.

Allopathic Hospitals,	162	37	22
Homœopathic " "	175	6	3

DR. ROUTH, "Fallacies of Homœopathy."

It is evident therefore, that the relative chances of recovery are greater under homœopathic treatment than under allopathic, by $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 in *inflammation of the lungs*; by 4 to 1 in *pleurisy*; by 3 to 1 in *inflammation of the bowels*; and by 7 to 1 in *dysentery*.

The following statistics of the treatment of epidemic cholera, in the year 1854, have been extracted from documents printed by order of the House of Commons. From these documents it appears that the mortality was as follows: in cholera cases generally, with or without collapse—

	Per cent.
Allopathic treatment, deaths,	45
Homœopathic " "	17

In collapse cases:

Allopathic treatment, deaths,	69
Homœopathic " "	30

Dr. MacLoughlin, one of the medical inspectors of the Board of Health, who visited the London Homœopathic Hospital, and saw the cases there treated, has stated publicly, that he saw "several cases that did well under homœopathic treatment, which he had no hesitation in saying would have sunk under any other."

II.—*Because Homœopathy CURES MORE QUICKLY than the old system.*

The opponent already quoted admits the fact that, in homœopathic hospitals, with the same number of beds appropriated to *pneumonia*, nearly twice the number of patients are admitted as in allopathic hospitals. He also states that in *pleurisy*, "the number of cases admitted are *at least double* the number admitted to allopathic institutions."

Dr. Henderson has also shown that, in the allopathic hospitals, the average duration of disease is 30 days, whilst it is only 10 days in similar diseases in the homœopathic hospitals.

It would be difficult to overrate the importance of this advantage. "To a working man, whose bread is earned by the 'sweat of his brow,' time is of the utmost importance; and it is a notorious fact that much distress has resulted from protracted illness of the father of a family, which has been occasioned by the maltreatment of old physic."

One of the advantages which would accrue to public hospitals by the adoption of the homœopathic treatment would be, that at least *twice the number* of patients might be admitted without increasing the number of beds, or any increase of expense, but most likely with even a diminution of the latter.

III.—*Because HOMŒOPATHY IS PLEASANTER than old physic.*

No one denies this. Contrast the sick room of an allopathic patient with that of a homœopathist. In the former, there are the bleeding basin, the repulsive leech, the blister, and its accompanying satellites—sores, salves and dressings; the emetic and its disgusting sequence, purgatives and their disagreeable (not to say injurious) consequences. Think of these, tormenting life's last and most sacred hours, and often inflicted on poor helpless infancy and terrified children, and you have a real "chamber of horrors," cruel and revolting enough for a society of savages; add to this also that these torments are not only useless, but pernicious beyond calculation, often indeed destroying, by such coarse and rude appliances, the very life they wish to save.

Look now at the chamber of the homœopathic patient: he is very ill, but the life's blood is spared; no bleeding-basins here, no discarded blisters, no leeches nor bloody clothes; the linen is clean, and the air is sweet; for there have been no emetics or purgatives, no salivation, nor its consequent stench; the only article in the room to remind one of sickness is, perhaps, a bottle or tumbler, containing, to all appearance, pure water; and, if the patient dies, his last hours are not tormented with well-meant cruelties, and his sufferings can generally be alleviated to the very last.

The following is the confession of a physician: "My conscience, without being struck down, was troubled at the means I employed, and which, though justified by *secundem artem*, were both barbarous and questionable, added fresh stings to disease, took away nature's chance, accelerated decay, and perturbed the last hours of this mortal life; there was also in them such a horrid war with the sad dignity proper to death-beds, with the repose of sick men, with the sweet pity of relatives, and the commiseration of attendants, with all soft dealing, with every principle of cleanliness and sweetness, that I could not but feel like a disturber and a violent man in recommending and superintending them on many a well remembered occasion.—Dr. JAMES J. G. WILKINSON.

This feature of homœopathy is particularly important in the case of infants. It is a mercy to relieve these little sufferers from any extra trial that can be avoided; but, besides this, the difficulty of administering nauseous medicines is so serious as to produce physical and mental disturbance, highly dangerous to the patient; whilst our doses excite no dread nor disgust, and provoke no resistance, and notwithstanding the opponents of homœopathy blindly persist in attributing its cures to imagination, the infant occupants of the nursery are often the subjects of its greatest triumphs.

IV.—HOMŒOPATHY DOES NOT WEAKEN THE PATIENT *by the depleting measures resorted to by the old school.*

This is an immense boon; for, when the disease is cured by homœopathic treatment, so is the patient; but, trite as this may sound, it is seldom so with allopathic patients in acute diseases. The means resorted to to cure the disease nearly kill the patient, so that he has to get back the strength of which he has been robbed, as best he can.

Dr. Sharp has well said, "The avoiding of blood-letting and the weakness caused by such loss of the vital fluid, is of itself a sufficient triumph for the new system; but when it is remembered that every painful and debilitating process, along with every disagreeable dose, is forever abandoned, how great is the emancipation, how substantial the triumph!"

This being the case, it follows that the period of convalescence is greatly shortened, or even superseded—the system soon recovers its equilibrium; whereas, after an acute illness, treated *secundem artem*, the system receives a shock from which it is long in recovering, and in some cases never does recover entirely.

V.—*Because Homœopathy is able to CURE NEW DISEASES with nearly as much certainty as old ones.*

The following is a striking illustration of this: "In the year 1831 the *cholera* invaded Germany from the East; and, on its

approach, Hahnemann, who had received descriptions of its peculiar symptoms, guided by the unerring therapeutic rule he had discovered, at once fixed upon the remedies which should prove specifics for it, and caused directions to be printed and distributed over the country by thousands, so that, on its actual invasion, the homœopathists, and those who had received Hahnemann's directions, were prepared for its treatment and prophylaxis (prevention), and thus there is no doubt many lives were saved and many victims rescued from the pestilence. On all sides statements were published, testifying to the immense comparative success that had attended the employment of the means recommended by Hahnemann *before he had seen or directly treated a single case.*" Here we see that "Hahnemann, from merely reading a description of one of the most appallingly rapid and fatal diseases, could confidently and dogmatically say that such and such a medicine will do good in this stage of the disease, such and such other medicines in that, and that the united experience of hundreds of practitioners in all parts of Europe and America should bear practical testimony to the accuracy of Hahnemann's conclusions."—Dr. DUDGEON.

This fact is one of NATIONAL IMPORTANCE. If it be true, and in homœopathy it certainly *is*, that a new disease—epidemic, for instance—can be prescribed for with as much certainty of success as one more familiar to us, by virtue of an unerring *law of nature*, surely it is of not less national importance than the sanitary measures which have for their object the checking of such epidemics.

VI.—*Because Homœopathy will OFTEN CURE DISEASED STATES WHICH ARE CONSIDERED INCURABLE by ordinary practice.*

In numerous *chronic diseases* this is the case. In *constipation of the bowels*, for instance, allopathy cannot cure; it can only give aperients or purgatives, which, instead of curing the evil increases it in the end; while, by a little care in selecting the right remedy, and patient perseverance, homœopathy generally cures it.

Again, although it is true, in a certain sense, that homœopathy neither supersedes nor interferes with surgery, yet it is often one of its happy triumphs to dispense with the operations of amputation and excision, by the radical cure of diseased parts, which allopathy would have consigned to the knife. Aconite has been called "the homœopathist's lancet," because it enables him entirely to do away with bleeding, and, to a certain extent, the saw and the knife have their rivals in our therapeutics.

VII.—*Homœopathy CAN BE APPLIED in some cases WHERE THE OLD SYSTEM CANNOT.*

In *lock-jaw*, for instance, it is impossible to administer large doses of medicine, but the homœopathist can insert his drops or globules within the lips, and the medicine will act, as has been often experienced. Again, “in cases of *acute inflammation in delicate persons*, where the local disease seems to call for depletion and a lowering treatment, and the constitution at the same time urgently requires to be strengthened, the practitioner of the old plan is placed between Scylla and Charybdis—his efforts to relieve the inflammation, in proportion to their activity, increase the general weakness; whilst the homœopathist meets with nothing to perplex him, and can do good without doing harm.”—Dr. SHARP.

Besides these important instances of *lock-jaw* and acute inflammation, there are cases of gastric derangement, where the stomach is so irritable as to reject instantly the smallest quantity of fluid, even a teaspoonful. Here again the difficulty is met by the simple expedient of globules, or by a drop of tincture applied to the tongue. In no case whatever, while there is life, is the homœopath compelled to echo the old lament, “I know what *would* do good, if it could be administered, or if the patient could bear it.”

In connection with this, it may also be remarked that—

VIII.—*Homœopathy will ALLEVIATE SUFFERING WHERE A CURE IS OUT OF THE QUESTION, and that without resorting to narcotics.*

In some organic diseases, for instance, where a cure cannot be expected, relief is often easily and certainly obtainable. In *consumption*, so frequent and so fatal, the patient's sufferings can be alleviated to the very end.

IX.—*I prefer Homœopathy, lastly, because, in ascertaining the properties of medicines, IT EXPERIMENTS ON HEALTHY PERSONS, AND NOT ON THE SICK.*

The object of these experimental “provings” is to ascertain the pure effects of each medicine on the human frame. If given to an invalid, its effects are of course complicated with his existing symptoms, and a pure result is impossible. To administer one medicine at a time, and that to a person free from previous symptoms, seems to commend itself clearly, as the *only possible* way to secure an answer to the question, “How does this medicine act, *per se*?”

The practice of trying the effects of drugs on persons suffering from disease is *cruel, dangerous, and unsatisfactory*; *cruel,*

because it tortures the patient already smitten down by disease; *disempowers*, because it often accelerates death or undermines the constitution; and almost always interposes *unnecessary* in the way of that tendency to recovery which *finite* Common Sense uniformly interposes with life; and *misdirects*, because it has during the centuries it has been practised achieved little or nothing for therapeutics. An eminent physician (Sir John Forbes) says: "Therapeutics *is*, the cure of diseases, are to a lamentable extent popularly and egregiously wrong," and that this department of medical science he "has put in its worst influence." Common sense, therefore, infers that they have been all along on the wrong track. Dr. Park, the late Professor of the College of Physicians, has also truly admitted, as regards the attainment of the medical problem: "the uncertain and precarious reputation of all" of them. Wouldn't his "provisional reputations" have existed after so many centuries, *marking* which they have been experimenting, if they had been on the right track? And it is not to be wondered at that investigations into the effects of single remedies should be so fruitless, when we consider the confusion and uncertainty necessarily encountered in attempting to make precise observations under such circumstances, for how can the observer possibly separate the pure results of the remedy from the symptoms of the disease, and how is confusion worse compounded by the common practice of *mixing* and *combining* different drugs together?

Such are some of my reasons for preferring homoeopathic treatment to that so long in vogue. These could easily have been multiplied and extended, but "a word to the wise is sufficient."

The writer does not claim to be in possession of medical knowledge, but feels safe so long as he keeps to the ground he has chosen—that of COMMON SENSE. Though not a medical man, he is glad to avail himself of a *FIRST* furnished by one, for the very purpose of judging of any new system of treatment. It is furnished by an eminent physician,* one who has written a work against homoeopathy, and gained a prize of five hundred dollars for it, so that there can be no possible reason for suspecting that they have been so constructed as to favor homoeopathy. We will apply them, therefore, in weighing its merits to the title of *good* or *bad* practice.

"Good practice," he says, "differs from its opposite thus:—

1.—It has a less number of fatal cases, in proportion to the whole number that need medical treatment!"

Thus we have shown to be the case with homoeopathy. (See Reason 1.)

* Dr. Hooker.

II.—It “has a less number of bad cases, because it avoids converting light cases into grave ones, and succeeds in arresting disease in many cases in its very commencement.”

This is exactly what homeopathy does; indeed our opponents sometimes cry out that our cases are not so “grave” as theirs, forgetting or ignoring the fact that this is one result of the superiority of our treatment, the cases under homeopathic treatment being taken indiscriminately from the same population. (See Reasons I., II., and IV.)

III.—The “patients have commonly a shorter sickness.”

This has been already shown to be the case with those under homeopathic treatment. (See Reason II.)

IV.—“They are in a better condition after they have recovered, less apt to have bad results left behind, and less liable to disease in future.”

This exactly characterizes the experience of homeopathic patients. (See Reason IV.)

V.—“He,” that is, the physician, who follows the practice which may be properly designated “good,” “has a less number of patients, and a smaller amount of sickness in the same number of families.”

This is notoriously true of homeopathic physicians, who are able to keep more than twice as many families in health as they could under the old system. (See Reasons II. and IV.)

Thus we see that any one of the tests, or all of them, applied to homeopathy, show it to be “good practice,” and the same rules applied to allopathy show it to be bad practice.

FROM ALL THESE CONSIDERATIONS, I AM JUSTIFIED IN MY PREFERENCE OF THE NEW SYSTEM TO THE OLD ONE; AND MY LIFE AND HEALTH, AND THOSE DEPENDENT ON ME, ARE SAFER UNDER HOMOEOPATHIC THAN UNDER ALLOPATHIC TREATMENT.

Truthful statistics show that in general diseases and cholera, there is about three times the mortality under allopathic as under the homeopathic treatment: in typhus fever nearly four times; in yellow fever eight times; in pneumonia nearly six times; making the general average mortality nearly five times in a given number of cases treated. This general average gives about eight deaths to homeopathy in every hundred treated, and more than thirty-four to allopathy, in like number of cases; that in every hundred deaths under the latter treatment, nearly seventy-seven would have been saved by the former method; that is, while allopathy loses one hundred, homeopathy loses only about twenty-three.

BY-LAWS

OF THE

Worcester County Homœopathic Medical Society.

ARTICLE I.

Society.

SECTION 1. This society shall consist of such persons as shall sign its By-Laws at its first formal meeting, and such other persons as may be elected in accordance with them.

ARTICLE II.

Officers of the Society.

SEC. 1.—The society, at its annual meeting, shall elect by ballot a President, Vice-President, Corresponding Secretary, Recording Secretary and Treasurer, and three Censors, who together shall constitute an Executive Committee, to whom shall be intrusted the general business of the society when not in session.

SEC. 2.—The officers shall continue in office until the adjournment of the annual meeting next after their election, at which time the duties of the newly elected officers shall commence.

ARTICLE III.

Duties of Officers.

SEC. 1.—The President shall preside at all meetings of the society and of the executive committee.

If the President is absent, his duties shall devolve upon the Vice-President, if present; otherwise on such person as the meeting may appoint.

SEC. 2.—The Corresponding Secretary shall have charge of all communications addressed to the society, and he shall prepare and transmit whatever communications the society or executive committee may direct.

SEC. 3.—The Recording Secretary shall give notice and keep a record of all the meetings of the society and of the executive committee, and shall transmit, at least two weeks before the annual meeting, to the Treasurer all the names of those who have become members during the year.

SEC. 4.—The Treasurer shall solicit and receive all moneys due the society, and shall pay all bills after approval by the President. He shall annually make a statement of expenses and amount of funds in his hands, to the society.

SEC. 5.—The Censors shall examine the qualifications of persons wishing membership, and report the result of their examination to the society.

ARTICLE IV.

Membership.

SEC. 1.—Any person in good standing as a physician, who practices medicine in accordance with the law "*Similia Similibus Curantur*," may become a member of the society after approval by the Censors.

He shall be elected by ballot, and after his election shall sign the by-laws before he shall be deemed a member.

SEC. 2.—Every member shall receive a certificate of membership signed by the President and Secretary.

SEC. 3.—Every member of the society shall be assessed annually two dollars, and such other assessments as a majority of the members may vote.

ARTICLE V.

Delegates.

SEC. 1.—The executive committee may appoint delegates to other societies or associations whenever they deem it advisable, and such delegates shall receive certificates of such appointment from the Recording Secretary.

ARTICLE VI.

Meetings of the Society.

SEC. 1.—The meetings of the society shall be held quarterly. The annual meeting shall be held on the second Wednesday in November, and the semi-annual meeting on the second Wednesday in May, at 10 o'clock A. M.; and the intermediate meetings on the second Wednesday of February and August, at two o'clock P. M.

SEC. 2.—The President, by the advice of the executive committee, may cause the Secretary to issue a call for a meeting whenever he deems the interests of the society demand.

ARTICLE VII.

Election of Officers.

SEC. 1.—The election of all officers of this society shall be by plurality of votes.

ARTICLE VIII.

Alterations and Amendments.

SEC. 1.—These by-laws may be altered or amended by a two-thirds vote of the society.

Homœopathy Thrives,

And like everything based on true principles, is aggressive. The Director of the New York Ophthalmic Hospital last year gave notice to the board of allopathic physicians that their services were no longer needed. The directors, in their report for this year, express the fullest confidence in the superiority of homœopathic practice in all *Diseases of the Eye, etc.*, and their high gratification with the results of treatment under the new system.

The rapid spread of homœopathy among the people, has furnished the means of lessening the death-rate in the communities in which it is practiced; and has induced the most acute of business men to establish life insurance companies, basing their operations on the fact that they can with safety insure lives of practical homœopathists for a lower rate than those under allopathic treatment, because homœopathic treatment saves so many more patients in proportion to the number treated. Some years ago the London Life Assurance Company, after a careful investigation of facts, commenced to insure lives of persons who employed our treatment, for ten per cent. *less* than those who were treated by the common system of drugging. We have already in the Northern States two strong, successful companies, and the third is now (1868) being established, located in the metropolis of America. Each of these companies insures the lives of practical homœopathists at a much lower rate than of those who employ allopathic physicians. All other companies must eventually follow their example, because they will learn that the increased *longevity* of homœopathists is so great as to safely permit it.

Thirty years ago there was but *one* homœopathic physician in New England. In 1857 there were one hundred and twenty in Massachusetts alone, while at the present time (1867) there are 251, showing an increase of one hundred per cent. in ten years. Our practice follows directly upon the footsteps of education and general intellectual progress. Ohio has 352 homœopathic physicians, while Kentucky, lying by its side, has only 44. Maryland has but 34, and Arkansas has less than 6; Michigan has 215, and Mississippi 16; Wisconsin has 200, and Missouri has 68.

No one can mistake the import of these "statistics." They show that homœopathy thrives in proportion to the general intelligence of communities, and are a sufficient answer to the oft repeated assertion of our opponents, that its doctrines are absurd and its practitioners are fools, or something worse. That our patrons are principally people of wealth and refinement, has always been a matter of pride to our school, and a very humiliating circumstance to our allopathic brethren.